
Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Hal W. Bochín

Source: *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 1 (Winter, 1998), pp. 101-104

Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3886134>

Accessed: 08/08/2010 02:20

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=taylorfrancis>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Taylor & Francis, Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*.

It lacks the entertainment value of the apocalyptic rhetoric, but it exhibits an intricacy, a technical mastery and a density that the "Jovian" rhetoric lacks. It is about time it was represented.

Despite some weaknesses, the book is a remarkable and extremely useful volume. It ought to remain the standard volume in the area for the next decade.

Andrew King
Speech Communication
Louisiana State University

***Rhetoric and Political Culture in Nineteenth-Century America*, edited by Thomas W. Benson. East Lansing: Michigan State UP, 1997. 200 pp.**

Based on papers presented at the Third Biennial Conference on Public Address, hosted by the University of Minnesota in September 1992, this title is the latest in a growing series in rhetoric and public affairs published by Michigan State University Press under the editorship of Martin Medhurst.

The book opens with Edwin Black's keynote address to the conference, "The Aesthetics of Rhetoric, American Style." Black's contribution, however, seems only tangentially related to the essays that follow or to the title of the book for that matter. Black, who examines how rhetorical tastes have changed over time, is primarily concerned with the evaluation of contemporary discourse and takes most of his examples from twentieth-century speakers. Black argues that American public discourse is shaped by "a dispositional or structural aesthetic that is associated with a rhetoric of power, and a stylistic or textural aesthetic that is associated with a rhetoric of character" (4). The key to understanding Black's own critical analysis of speeches by Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon, however, may be found in these words: "What we admire in discourse is intermixed with what we value. We exalt what we think beautiful and think beautiful what we exalt" (13). Thus Black's critique of Nixon's 1968 convention acceptance speech amounts to little more than bombast. Language that received praise from contemporary auditors Black dismisses as "the personal usurpation of a communal occasion, the unbandaged festering of a swollen ego" (6).

The next four essays, together with their responses, show how a close textual reading of significant public rhetoric can illuminate nineteenth-century culture. Although Benson's Preface seems to promise conflict between essay and response, most respondents are content to "examine in further detail" (39) or "advance further a specific aspect" (72) rather than to challenge or debate. Maurice Charland's response to Michael Leff offers a major and lively exception.

James M. Ferrill begins the critiques of nineteenth-century texts with "The Speech Within: Trope and Performance in Daniel Webster's Eulogy to Adams

and Jefferson.” In a remarkable coincidence John Adams and Thomas Jefferson died on the same day, July 4, 1826. Called upon to memorialize the two founding fathers, Daniel Webster offered a joint eulogy at Faneuil Hall in Boston on August 2. As part of his commemorative address Webster appears to quote directly from an address by Adams supporting the Declaration of Independence at the Continental Congress. Webster, however, was not quoting Adams; he composed Adams’ remarks himself. Ferrill argues, “Taking the fictional address as an instance of one or more of what Kenneth Burke called the four master tropes [metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and irony] we gain critical insight into many of the key structural, generic, historical, performatory, and ideological aspects of Webster’s eulogy” (17). Using these Burkean categories, Ferrill concludes that Webster not only met the demands of a commemorative address, his use of the fictional speech allowed him “to cast the revolutionary eloquence of John Adams in a fashion that served the ideological needs of Webster’s day” (32). Furthermore, as Webster advanced the importance of Adams’ eloquence as a paradigm of public service, he enhanced his own reputation as well.

Stephen H. Browne comments on Ferrill’s essay in “Webster’s Eulogy and the Tropes of Public Memory.” Browne argues that synecdoche is the dominant and enabling trope in Webster’s essay, used to put a Whig conception of history into the imaginary words of John Adams. He finds that synecdoche governs the internal action of the text and its system of referents. Through its use, Webster “was able to simultaneously concentrate and expand the Whig claim to an American birthright” (44).

John Louis Lucaites offers “The Irony of ‘Equality’ in Black Abolitionist Discourse: The Case of Frederick Douglass’s ‘What to the Slave is the Fourth of July?’” Douglass’s speech, Lucaites argues, deserves attention because Douglass “employed an ironic framework to craft a usage of equality that would reconstitute the national public forum as a dialogue between past, present, and future, and thus enact a legitimate public space for a uniquely *African-American* political voice” (49). Lucaites demonstrates how Douglass provided an interpretation of the Constitution as an anti-slavery document based on principles enumerated in the Declaration of Independence. He concludes that “By entering the voice of that [African-American] community in a dialogue between the nation’s past, present, and future, Douglass sought to legitimize the presence of a uniquely African-American identity and, in doing so, to vitalize America’s commitment to equality as a flexible but pivotal foundation for the nation’s enlightened political identity” (65).

James Jasinski responds to Lucaites in “Rearticulating History in Epideictic Discourse: Frederick Douglass’s ‘The Meaning of the Fourth of July to the Negro.’” Jasinski believes that Douglass’s most important objective was to construct an understanding of the American Revolution as a continuing project in contrast to the prevailing view of the revolution as completed and no longer a vital force in contemporary life. Jasinski claims that Douglass was able to show

that the true heirs of the revolutionary generation were the abolitionists and that the Constitution did not mark the end of the revolution but "the first act of a continuing revolution" (84).

In "The Dynamics of Intertextuality: Re-reading the Declaration of Independence," Martha Soloman Watson attempts to show how texts interanimate each other, that is "rhetors, as audiences for previous texts, interpret those as a basis for their own products and these 'new' products, in turn, reconstrue and alter the 'meaning' of the texts on which they are based" (93). Watson examines two texts that deliberately echoed the Declaration of Independence, the "Declaration of Sentiments" of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1833 and the "Declaration of Sentiments" adopted by the Women's Rights Convention, meeting at Seneca Falls, New York in 1848. She concludes that by basing their own statements on the Declaration of Independence both abolitionists and women strategically improved their positions; but, more importantly, "the interpretations and uses to which these groups put the Declaration of Independence worked to change the socially constructed meaning and implications of that text as well" (103).

In "Garrison at Philadelphia: The 'Declaration of Sentiments' as Instrumental Rhetoric," David Henry approaches the Anti-Slavery Society's "Declaration of Sentiments" as an example of "(1) purposive discourse, (2) shaped by a skilled writer, (3) for suasory effect on a target audience, (4) in response to immediate situational constraints" (114). Finding much to agree with in Watson's essay, Henry complements her analysis with a thoughtful assessment of the "Sentiments" that exposes the "abolitionists' text as a immediate call for action, designed to unify a disparate audience" (127).

Michael Leff offers "Lincoln Among the Nineteenth-Century Orators," a study of how three speakers (Henry Grady, Frederick Douglass, and Jane Addams) interpreted and appropriated Lincoln in their own speeches. Each of the speakers connected the present with the past through their interpretations of Lincoln, interpretations that Leff shows to be fundamentally different because of the speakers' own histories, politics, and ethics.

In his response to Leff, "Anxious Oratory-Anxious Criticism: The Substance of Deferral and the Deferral of Substance," Maurice Charland is less concerned with the specifics of Leff's analysis than with its underlying assumptions and overall value: "What exactly is being studied here? And what kind of knowledge is being produced? Is the ultimate focus Lincoln, the rhetorical figure of invocation, or the oratory of Grady, Douglass, and Addams? . . . Leff's analysis suffers from an excess of coherence, for it does not address the incoherences both within and between the texts he considers" (159).

Robert Hariman concludes the volume with a thought provoking critique of two main types of public address studies, which he labels the neo-classical and the post-structural. He observes that the neo-classical approach defines public address as "situated, artistic, civic discourse: Oratory remains the premier genre of public address and the basic object of analysis is the individual speech, which

is understood to address a particular situation and to be oriented towards a tangible policy or definition of civic culture" (167). The post-structural approach claims that "oratory died while the public sphere was mutating into a media culture. This approach challenges every assumption of authorial intention, textual practice, civic context, and political privilege that is embedded in the classical model. The basic object of analysis is the social structure controlling comprehensive processes of discourse production and reception. . ." (167). To locate a middle way between the two perspectives Hariman proposes a reconsideration of the concept of persuasive artistry, which in turn calls for closer attention being given to imitation: "The idea that a text should be imitated is a hermeneutical idea: it sets in motion a process of interpreting the text which in turn defines the relationship between text and context . . . motivates construction of a canon, directly shapes the composition of subsequent texts, and can be a powerful means for reproduction of the genre and the social order" (173).

Editorially the book is done well. Few proofing errors can be found. The usefulness of a thorough index is reduced, however, by a very bad decision to place the page numbers near the gutter instead of on the outer edge of each page. Not meant for the general reader, the language of this volume is often jargon-laden and occasionally dense. The most engaging writing is found in two excerpts from other authors, Robert Gunderson's essay on Daniel Webster and Garry Wills' analysis of the "Gettysburg Address." Nevertheless, because of the excellent and often astute examples of close textual reading it provides and because of the way in which Hariman's essay clarifies important methodological questions facing rhetorical critics, this volume should be required reading for anyone interested in contemporary rhetorical criticism.

Hal W. Bochín
Department of Speech Communication
California State University, Fresno

***Rhetorical Hermeneutics: Invention and Interpretation in the Age of Science*, edited by Alan G. Gross & William M. Keith. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press. 1997. 371 pp.**

R*hetorical Hermeneutics: Invention and Interpretation in the Age of Science* is an unusual and provocative book which should interest readers of *RSQ*. Reviewers of collections often have a difficult time deciding whether to focus on the overall concept of the collection or on individual essays, on the forest or the trees, and this dilemma arises because few collections have the Aristotelian integritas that their editors suppose and which Stephen Dedalus urges every work of art to have. *Rhetorical Hermeneutics* is a welcome exception in this respect,